

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-7, 9-10, 12-13, 15-18 and 20 are currently pending and stand rejected.

In this amendment, claims 1, 7, 12, 15, and 20 are amended. No new matter is believed added by the amendments. Claims 1-7, 9-10, 12-13, 15-18 and 20 will remain pending upon entry of this amendment.

Claim 20 is objected for lack of antecedent basis.

Claims 1-2, 5-7, 9-10, 12-13, 15-16, and 20 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent No. 6,643,613 to McGee ("McGee") in view of US Patent No. 6,633,230 to Grandin et al. ("Grandin").

Claims 3-4 and 17-18 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over McGee in view of Grandin and, further in view of US Patent No. 6,714,976 to Wilson ("Wilson").

Reconsideration of the rejection is requested based on the following comments.

Claim Objections

Paragraph [0036] has been amended to recite "computer-readable memory media" instead of "Memory media." As disclosed in [0036], program 1101 is stored on the memory media. In paragraph [0035] of the specification as filed, a description of "the program" 1101 (Fig. 1) is given. The figure clearly shows program 1101, referred to as a computing module, is stored in a data storage device 1701. The figure clearly shows the CPU 1702 executes the computing module 1101. Applicant submits that no new matter is added by this amendment since the specification as filed provides support for the memory media being computer readable, as discussed above. Applicant submits that this provides the necessary antecedent basis for claim 20 and respectfully requests that the objection to claim 20 be withdrawn.

Claim Objections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claim 1, as amended, recites in part:

...a processor configured to compare the identifier associated with the first managed computer with a sender managed computer that sends the information relating to the event; and

if it is determined that the first managed computer is same as the sender managed computer, storing the information relating to the event and operating data of the monitoring object associated with the event, in the memory; and

if it is determined that the first managed computer is different from the sender managed computer, not storing the information relating to the event and operating data of the monitoring object associated with the event, in the memory...

In an illustrative embodiment of the present invention, the processor in the management computer compares an identifier associated with the managed computer, that includes the monitoring object that is being monitored, to the sender computer that sends the information relating to the event. If it is determined that both these computers are the same "it is known that the operating data is the operating data which was collected from the same host as the event sender host." (Specification at ¶ [0074] and Fig. 8). In this instance, the operating data is stored in the memory. If the two computers are not judged to be the same, operating data is not stored.

The Office Action acknowledges that McGee "does not specifically teach when to store the operating data." (Office Action at page 4). Applicant submits that Grandin does not cure this deficiency in McGee.

Grandin is generally related to managing networks. More specifically, Grandin discloses a method for managing a plurality of stress metrics for a network. If a stress level of a particular stress metric exceeds a predetermined threshold value, "network management station 3A stores details about the monitored stress level in an Event log in memory." (Grandin at col 5, lines 20-25). Thus, even though Grandin discloses storing a particular stress metric based on comparison with a threshold value for that stress metric, there is no teaching or suggestion in Grandin about comparing an "identifier associated with the first managed computer with a sender managed computer that sends the information relating to the event", and either storing the operating data or not based on the comparison results, at least as recited in claim 1 above.

Applicant submits that McGee and Grandin in combination do not teach or suggest all the features of amended claim 1. Hence, claim 1 and its dependent claims 2-6 are allowable over McGee and Grandin for at least the reasons stated above.

Amended claims 7, 12, and 15 recite features similar to claim 1. Hence, Applicant submits that claims 7 and 15 and their respective dependent claims are also allowable over McGee and Grandin for at least the reasons stated above in connection with claim 1.

Amended claim 20 recites features similar to claim 1. Hence, Applicant submits that claim 20 is also allowable over McGee and Grandin for at least the reasons stated above in connection with claim 1.

Further, Applicant submits that Wilson does not cure the deficiencies in McGee and Grandin. Hence, Applicant submits all the pending claims are also allowable over Wilson, taken singly, or even in combination with McGee and Grandin.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicant believes all claims now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance and an action to that end is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 650-326-2400.

Respectfully submitted,

/Girish Basarkar/

Girish M. Basarkar
Reg. No. 64,508

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor
San Francisco, California 94111-3834
Tel: 650-326-2400
Fax: 415-576-0300
GIB:glb
62128249 v1